Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 1 of 10

	-
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
-5816	13
)2) 382-	14
4X: (7(
7111 F.	15 16
2) 382-(17
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816	18 19
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

1			
1	Marquis Aurbach Coffing		
2	CRAIG R. ANDERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 6882		
3	10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145		
4	Telephone: (702) 382-0711 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816		
5	canderson@maclaw.com		
6	Attorneys for Defendants		
7	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT CO	URT
8	DISTRICT O	F NEVADA	
9	RAYMOND ROMERO,		
10	Plaintiff,	Case No:	2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ
11	VS.		
12	LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE		
13	DEPARTMENT; OFFICER RICARDO LARA, individually and in his official capacity;		
14	OFFICER JOEY HERNANDEZ, individually		
15	and in his official capacity; DOES III through X, DOES XI through XX,		
16	Defendants.		
17			

JOINT PRE-TRIAL ORDER

M.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit. Plaintiff's remaining allegations are: (1) whether the Defendant officers violated Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment rights by using excessive force when the Defendant Officers detained Plaintiff on August 29, 2008; (2) whether the Defendant officers violated Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection rights by discriminating against him based upon his race; (3) whether the Defendant officers committed the state law tort of battery; and (4) whether the Defendant officers were negligent.

Las vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

m		
B 33		

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Plaintiff's federal claims are brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff's state law claims are properly before this Court under the doctrine of pendant jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

III.

STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS

The following relevant facts are admitted by the parties and require no proof:

- 1. Plaintiff demands a jury trial.
- 2. On or around August 29, 2008, Plaintiff was a visitor to Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 3. On August 29, 2008, Ofc. Ricardo Lara was a police officer with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and operating in the course and scope of his employment.
- 4. On August 29, 2008, Ofc. Joey Hernandez was a police officer with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and operating in the course and scope of his employment.
 - 5. LVMPD is a municipality in Clark County, Nevada.

IV.

STATEMENT OF UNCONTESTED FACTS

The following facts, though not admitted, will not be contested at trial by evidence to the contrary:

- 1. Plaintiff suffered a broken ankle on August 29, 2008.
- 2. Plaintiff required emergency medical care on August 29, 2008 and was taken to Sunrise hospital by ambulance, with the ambulance being summonsed by the LVMPD.
- 3. According to Plaintiff's medical records, on August 29, 2008, Sunrise Hospital Medical Center lists Plaintiff's blood alcohol at .21 percent.
 - 4. Plaintiff was not arrested or cited by Defendants on August 29, 2008.
 - 5. Both Defendant Officers are Hispanic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 3 of 10

- Plaintiff is Hispanic. 6.
- 7. Defendant Officer Hernandez punched Plaintiff with a closed fist on August 29. 2008.
- 8. Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Fourteenth Amendment due process claim against the Defendant officers was dismissed by the Court.
- 9. All Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against LVMPD were dismissed by the Court.
- 10. Plaintiff's state law negligent hiring, training, and supervising claims were dismissed by the Court.
- 11. Plaintiff's state law intentional infliction of emotional distress claim was dismissed by the Court.

V.

STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES OF FACT

The following are the issues of fact to be tried and determined upon trial.

- 1. The uniforms the Defendant officers were wearing.
- Whether the Defendant officers announced their presence prior making physical 2. contact with Plaintiff.
- 3. Whether a reasonable officer could have concluded that the circumstances surrounding the disturbance warranted immediate intervention by the Defendant officers.
- 4. Whether the Defendant officers had reasonable suspicion to take Plaintiff into custody and, if so, whether the Defendant officers used reasonable force in taking Plaintiff into custody.
- 5. Whether the Defendant officers issued verbal commands, and if so, whether Plaintiff ignored the commands or was given an opportunity to comply.

10 11 12 (702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 4 of 10

- 6. Whether the Defendant officers approached Plaintiff from behind, without his knowledge or any warning.
 - 7. How Plaintiff was taken to the ground.
 - 8. What happened once Plaintiff went to the ground.
 - 9. Whether Plaintiff was ever up on top of Defendant Lara while on the ground.
 - 10. Whether Defendant Hernandez punched Plaintiff on the side or in the face.
 - 11. Whether Defendant Hernandez gave Plaintiff instructions to guit resisting.
 - 12. Whether Plaintiff ignored any instructions to quit resisting.
 - 13. Whether any of the Defendant officers' actions were racially motivated.
 - 14. The extent of Plaintiff's pain and suffering.
 - 15. Whether Plaintiff requires future medical care and treatment.
 - 16. Whether Plaintiff's medical care and treatment was reasonable.

VI.

STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES OF LAW

The following are the issues of law to be tried and determined upon trial.

- Whether the Defendant officers had reasonable suspicion to take Plaintiff into 1. custody.
 - 2. Whether Plaintiff was detained lawfully.
- 3. Whether the force used by the officers to take Plaintiff into custody was reasonable or excessive.
 - 4. Whether the Defendant officers racially discriminated against the Plaintiff.
- 5. Whether the Defendant officers are protected by the doctrine of qualified immunity.
 - 6. Whether an unprivileged battery of Plaintiff occurred.

Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 5 of 10

Name of the last o			f.	LVMPD's Arrest Policy and Procedures (LVMPD 0050-57)
2			g.	LVMPD's policies regarding requesting medical (LVMPD 0058)
3			h.	Plaintiff's answers to interrogatories
4	W>	ACT	A TIN	
5	В.			E FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS THE PARTIES ACHED THE STIPULATIONS STATED:
6		1.	Plair	atiff's exhibits: None
7		2.	Defe	ndants' exhibits: None
8 9	C.	THE	SAMI	E FOLLOWING EXHIBITS, THE PARTY AGAINST WHOM E WILL BE OFFERED OBJECTS TO THEIR ADMISSION E GROUNDS STATED:
10		1.	Plain	tiff's exhibits:
11			a.	Plaintiff's unofficial transcripts (Pltf 0005-09). Objection:
12	authenticity, t	foundat	ion, re	levance, and best evidence.
13			b.	Plaintiff's work history (Pltf 0010-11). Objection: relevance,
14	foundation an	nd best	eviden	ce.
15			c.	Plaintiff's medical care statements (Pltf 0013-34). Objection:
16	Collateral sou	ırce, be	st evid	ence, and authentication.
17			d.	Remaining pages from Use of Force Report of Ricardo Lara
18	(LVMPD 000	06-0011). Obj	ection: Relevance, speculation, subsequent remedial measure, and
19	more prejudio	cial than	n proba	tive.
20			e.	Remaining pages from Use of Force Report of Joey Hernandez
21	(0014-0020).	Object	tion: R	elevance, speculation, subsequent remedial measure, and more
22	prejudicial tha	an prob	ative.	
23		2.	Defe	ndants' exhibits:
24	None.			
25	D.	DEP	OSITI	ONS:
26		1.	Plain	tiff will offer the following depositions: Plaintiff will offer the
27	depositions of	f any w	itness ı	unavailable at the time of trial or for impeachment purposes.
28		2.	Defe	ndants will offer the following depositions: Defendants will offer th
	l			

Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 7 of 10

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

depositions of any witness unavailable at the time of trial or for impeachment purposes.

E. OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITIONS:

- 1. Defendants object to plaintiff's depositions as follows: Defendants object to the use of Sgt. Norm Jahn's depositions except as to the portions regarding his personal involvement in the events of August 28, 2009. Defendants object to plaintiff using any portions of Sgt. Jahn's deposition regarding his subsequent investigation and any opinions that contain subsequent remedial measures.
 - 2. Plaintiff objects to defendant's depositions as follows: None.

VIII.

WITNESSES

The following witnesses may be called by the parties upon trial:

A. STATE THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:

- 1. Raymond Romero, c/o McFarling Benson, 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G, Las Vegas, NV 89102.
- 2. Francis Martinez, c/o McFarling Benson, 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G, Las Vegas, NV 89102.
- 3. Kevin P. Moore, M.D., c/o Sunrise Hospital, 3186 South Maryland Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV 89109.
- 4. Geoffrey Landis, D.O., c/o Tucson Orthopaedic Institute, 1521 E. Tangerine Rd., Ste. 101, Oro Valley, AZ 85737.
- 5. Sgt. Norman Jahn, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89145.
- 6. Ofc. Ricardo Lara, c/o Marquis Aurbach Coffing, 10001 Park Run Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89145.

Case 2:10-cv-00537-RLH-RJJ Document 37 Filed 06/01/11 Page 8 of 10

1	7. Jack Ryan, Legal and Liability Risk Management Institute, Public Agency
2	Training Counsel, Inc., 5325 Decatur Boulevard, Indianapolis, IN 46241.
3	IX.
4	Counsel have met and herewith submit a list of three (3) agreed-upon trial dates:
5	November 1, 2011, November 14, 2011 and December 5, 2011
6	X.
7	It is estimated that the trial herein will take a total of 4 days.
8	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:
9	MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING MCFARLING BENSON
10	
11	By: Craig R. Anderson, Esq. By: Emily McFarling Bergon, Esq.
12	Nevada Bar No. 6882 Nevada Bar No. 8567 10001 Park Run Drive 2800 W. Sahara Ave., #6G
13	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Las Vegas, NV 89102
14	Attorney for Defendants Attorney for Plaintiff
15	Х.
16	ACTION BY THE COURT
17	a. This case is set for 'jury trial on the 'stacked calendar on
18	November 14, 2011, 8:30 a.m. Calendar call shall be held on November 9, 2011, 8:45 a.m.
19	b. Trial briefs, proposed jury instructions and proposed voir dire questions
20	shall be filed electronically no later than 12:00 p.m., November 9, 2011.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	Page 9 of 10 M&A:05166-411 1355871_1.DOC 5/23/2011 3:52 PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The foregoing pretrial order has been approved by the parties to this action as evidenced
by the signatures of their counsel hereon, and the order is hereby entered and will govern the trial
of this case. This order shall not be amended except by order of the court pursuant to agreement
of the parties or to prevent manifest injustice.

Dated: June 1, 2011

UNITED STATES DISTRICT

JUDGE

(NOTE: Due to the unusually large number of complex criminal) cases set for lengthy trials before this Court, civil trials may possibly be held in a "trailing status" for weeks or months, or they may be assigned to another trial Judge, who will be identified at calendar call. Therefore, the Court strongly urges the parties to consider their option to proceed before a U.S. Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule IB 2-2, in accordance with 28 USC Section 636(c) and FRCP 73.) "AO 85 Notice of Availability, Consent and Order of Reference Exercise of Jurisdiction by a U.S. Magistrate Judge" form is available on the Court's website www.nvd.uscourts.gov. Consent forms should NOT be electronically filed. Upon consent of all the parties, counsel are advised to manually file the form with the Clerk's Office.